



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,749	06/28/2001	Ikuo Sasazaki	826.1732	3645
21171	7590	04/25/2008	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			PESIN, BORIS M	
SUITE 700				
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2174	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/25/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/892,749	SASAZAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BORIS PESIN	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 January 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 9-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 9-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive the amendment filed 1/28/2008.

Claims 1-4 and 9-13 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 1/28/2008, Claims 1, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 were amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 2 and 9 – 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoof, II (US 5440624) in view of Towell (US 6052680) further in view of Smiga et al. (US 6029171).

In regards to claim 1, Schoof teaches an apparatus, comprising: a storage unit storing information about a discussion at an electronic conference, the information including respective utterance objects of respective speakers in the discussion (“transcription and digital storage of a complete record of the conference”, Column 3, Line 17). Schoof does not specifically teach a judgment unit calculating one of a number of speakers in the discussion, a number of utterance objects in the discussion, a depth of a tree structure of the information stored about the discussion and a data amount of the information stored about the discussion as an index of an amount of the information stored about the discussion and said judgment unit deciding to hold a face-to-face conference if the index exceeds a specific value.

Towell teaches, “In the following, an exemplary system for determining whether to route an incoming e-mail to a rule-based system for responding to a product inquiry and/or a rule-based system for scheduling a meeting is described. Referring to FIG. 2, in this exemplary system, the message preprocessing process 260 is a text to word list translation process (see, e.g., the process 600 of FIG. 6), the relevance determination process 280 is a process for determining a cosine distance (see, e.g., steps 502, 504 and 506 of FIG. 5) between an m-dimensional vector based on a preprocessed message and an m-dimensional vector based on a word list which characterizes a decision system, the decision system 1 process 220a is a rule-based decision process for scheduling a meeting, the decision system N process 220b is a rule-based decision process for responding to a product information request, the input/output interface process(es) 230 includes a SCSI adapter, the decision parameter(s) storage area 270

includes a predetermined threshold value between zero (0) and one (1), the firm data storage area 250 contains product information, and the user data storage area includes data regarding a salesperson's work schedule, times when he or she will be in the office, and a rank ordered list of others which will handle the salespersons e-mail in their absence." (Column 8, Lines 5-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schoof with the teachings of Towell and include a rule based system to schedule a meeting when certain criteria is met with the motivation to provide the user with a simple method of scheduling a meeting when appropriate.

Schoof and Towell do not specifically teach that words are utterance objects, which include data and a procedure for the data, and a reply link information to another utterance object. Smiga teaches that words are utterance objects, which include data and a procedure for the data, and a reply link information to another utterance object (i.e. "parser 300 of the present invention recognized the keyword "call" in the input keynote and determined that this text input keyword should be linked to or related to the "Calls" list. The parser 300 of the present invention also recognized the keyword "Scott" and determined that this contact name should be linked to the contact object "Scott Jones". The word "tomorrow" was also recognized by parser 300, which calculated tomorrow's date (i.e., current date+1 day) and linked is date object to the input keynote. The keywords "Engineering meeting" were recognized by parser 300 as a link to the previously defined "arrange Engineering meetings until Dennis gets back"

project object. Note that the present invention displays these links between the input keynote and corresponding linked object types in the data areas for the list, project, contact, or date/time calendar event objects in display region 250." Column 9, Line 60 – Column 10 Line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schoof and Towell with the teachings of Smiga and include parsed word objects that links to other objects with the motivation to ease the computer user's workload by anticipating his/her intentions based on the natural language text expression that has been entered (Smiga Column 10, Lines 9-12)

In regards to claim 2, Schoof-Towell-Smiga teach all the limitations of claim 1. Towell further teaches an apparatus further comprising a notification unit notifying participants of the electronic conference of a holding of the face-to-face conference if said judgment unit determines to hold the face-to-face conference. (Figures 11-13).

Claims 9-13 are similar in scope to claim 1; therefore they are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoof-Towell- Smiga in view of Garback et al. (US 5237499).

In regards to claim 3, Schoof-Towell- Smiga teach all the limitations of claim 2. They do not teach an apparatus further comprising a reservation unit making reservations for facilities needed to hold the face-to-face conference if said judgment unit determines to hold the face-to-face conference, said notification unit notifies expected participants of information about reserved facilities. Garback teaches a

method wherein, "The CPU is programmed to select an individual group member itinerary for the specific venue which includes specific airline flights, and if necessary, specific hotel accommodations and specific rental car services." (Abstract, Line 14). Garback further teaches, "A response message, such as is illustrated in FIG. 4, is formatted in step 69 to be returned to the individual group member traveler." (Column 7, Line 15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Schoof-Towell- Smiga with teachings of Garback to include a method of reserving facilities needed to hold meetings with the motivation to provide a convenient process of organizing the facilities to host a meeting.

In regards to claim 4, Schoof-Towell- Smiga and Garback teach all the limitations of claim 3. Garback further teaches apparatus wherein said reservation unit makes reservations for transportation needed for the expected participants to participate at the face-to-face conference ("The CPU is programmed to select an individual group member itinerary for the specific venue which includes specific airline flights, and if necessary, specific hotel accommodations and specific rental car services." Abstract, Line 14); and said notification unit notifies the expected participants of information about reserved transportation. ("A response message, such as is illustrated in FIG. 4, is formatted in step 69 to be returned to the individual group member traveler." Column 7, Line 15).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 and 9-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BORIS PESIN whose telephone number is (571)272-

4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2174

*/David A Wiley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174*